<div align="center">REMARKS</div>

The Examiner rejected claims rejected claims 1-2, 4-6, 18-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); rejected claims 7 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); objected to claims 3, 8-10, 20, and 25-27 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 1-14 and 18-31 remain in the case.

<div align="center">Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-6, 18-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)</div>

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-6, 18-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Penney (U.S. Patent No. 4,707,727). In particular, the Examiner writes:

> "Penny discloses a system which provides a single color (luminance and color difference signals) to display modifier 18 and display 20, in the event the input video which is converted from luminance/color difference into RGB pixels which subsequently derives a gamut error signal or not … Thus, if there is no error the pixels are in a single color, whereas if there is a gamut error, a correction (i.e. false color) is applied thereby anticipating the claimed invention." (Page 2, ¶ 1)

Applicant is confused by the Examiner's position because Applicant sees no teaching or suggestion that Penney's luminance and color difference signal ("video in") and the pixels of Penney's waveform or display monitor 20 are a "single color" (i.e. monochrome) in the absence of a gamut error. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite evidence to support his position.

Applicant defines "monochrome" as having equal values of red, green, and blue, with the luminance component being used to set the intensity of the pixel. (Page 3, lines 2-3 and page 5, lines 1-3 of the specification) Applicant sees no indication that Penney's "video in" signal is constrained in such a manner. Penney's "video in" signal is a standard (non-monochromatic) video signal, and thus, in the absence of a gamut error, the image displayed on the waveform or display monitor 20 is a standard (non-monochromatic) video image.

Because Applicant sees no teaching or suggest in Penney that "each pixel be[] in *monochrome* except when the gamut error signal indicates a gamut error," Applicant again submits that claims 1 and 18 are not anticipated by Penney, and thus requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4-6, and 19, 21-23 are patentable because they depend from claims 1 and 18 respectively, both of which are patentable, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2, 4-6, and 19, 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 7 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Penney in view of the Examiner's official notice that time stamping is used in the gamut correction field to log/account at what time a video signal encountered an error and thus allow a system to account and correct for the error. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 7 and 24 are patentable because they depend from claims 1 and 18 respectively, both of which are patentable, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 7 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Objection to Claims 3, 8-10, 20, and 25-27

The Examiner objected to claims 3, 8-10, 20, and 25-27 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3, 8-10, 20, and 25-27 are patentable in their present form because they depend from claims 1 and 18 respectively, both of which are patentable, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to claims 3, 8-10, 20, and 25-27 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1-14 and 18-31 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin T. Ivers

By:___/Matthew D. Rabdau/_____

Matthew D. Rabdau
Reg. No. 43,026
(503) 627-5068 (Voice)
(503) 627-7119 (Fax)

December 5, 2006
Tektronix, Inc.
P.O. Box 500
Delivery Station 50-LAW
Beaverton, OR 97077